

Wisconsin who have an opportunity to get the cut-over lands back into their best use—forestry.”

An editorial in the November 29, 1927 issue of *The Rhinelander Daily News* states that the paper had received dispatches from Madison to the effect that the State Conservation Commission was heartily in favor of the proposed federal forest reserve. The editorial said that the message from Madison could “be interpreted in no other fashion than that which indicates the commission’s displeasure with the activities of C.L. Harrington in appearing before the Forest County Board.” The *Daily News* editorial also cited an editorial from the *Antigo Journal* which states:

“The *Antigo Journal* urges Forest county to convene in special session and cancel their former action and to act favorably on the matter. Langlade county will join in on the forest project when they are asked, but Langlade county had not been contacted by the forest service. The *Journal* supports the proposed forest based on future values of the land 25 to 30 years hence.”

In tabling the issue of a federal forest, the Forest County Board did not dismiss the idea out of hand. In later meetings they agreed to discuss the matter further at the February 1928 board meeting. That discussion resulted in two significant actions. First that the question of a federal forest would be put to a county wide referendum at the spring elections scheduled for April 3, 1928; and second that the county board would sponsor a public information meeting on the issue prior to the election.

The March 15, 1928 edition of *The Forest County Republican* reported the substance of the public meeting held March 14, 1928, at the Court House in Crandon, Wisconsin. Representing the Forest Service were L.A. Kneipp, Assistant Chief Forester from Washington, D.C., and E.W. Tinker from the Denver, Colorado Region 2 office, that at that time, had responsibility for Forest Service activities in the Lakes States area. The State of Wisconsin was represented by O.C. Lemke, Wausau, Wisconsin, a member of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission; Col. L.B. Nagler, Conservation Director, Madison, Wisconsin, and C.L. Harrington, Wisconsin Chief Forester, Madison, Wisconsin. Numerous county board officials were present as well as citizens from Antigo, Rhinelander, and Park Falls, Wisconsin. The article specifically notes that the representatives from Park Falls were present as part “of a move to get this proposed national forest established in Price county, in case the voters of Forest county turned down the proposition.”

At the completion of the public meeting the fate of the future Nicolet National Forest rested with the voters of Forest County. This position was highlighted in an editorial appearing in *The Forest Republican*, March 29, 1928.

“There are several counties in the state who only wish that the voters of Forest county will turn down the proposed proposition so that they will get a chance to secure this forest reserve for their county. The *Forest Republican* believes that if we turn it down and the reserve goes to some other county; we will regret it later when the benefits begin to accrue to the counties entertaining it.”

On April 3, 1928, the voters of Forest county approved the establishment of a purchase unit in Forest County. The referendum passed in all precincts in the county with the exception of the town of Alvin. At the May 2, 1928 county board meeting, the Forest

County Board voted unanimously to approve the federal forest reserve. The board approved a purchase unit as proposed, except it did not include any of the proposed purchase area within the town of Alvin. Forest County action led to establishment of a three county purchase unit encompassing approximately 148,480 acres within the boundary proposed by the Forest Service.

While Forest County action appeared to be the last approval required to advance the proposal to the National Forest Reservation Commission in Washington, D.C., for final approval, one more hurdle appeared at the last moment. The state’s legislation authorized the State Land Commission, composed of the state treasurer, secretary of state, and attorney general, to “sell and convey for a fair consideration to the United States any state land within such areas” (i.e. State School Trust Lands). An article in the May 17, 1928, *Rhinelander Daily News* reported that the State Land Commission had refused to approve the plan for national forest lands in Wisconsin. The article reported that the objection was based on a concern that some of the state lands secured loans to school districts in each of the counties. While the objection of the land commission was not reported as final, the delay was enough to prevent the proposed purchase unit from coming before the National Forest Reservation Commission’s May meeting. Since the National Forest Reservation Commission met only twice per year, in May and December, the last minute objection effectively delayed the proposal.

Six days later, *The Rhinelander Daily News* reported that the State Land Commission approved federal forest areas in Bayfield, Forest, Oneida, Price, and Vilas counties. The Land Commission adopted a position accepting the plan for federal forests, but specified that lands securing loans in the forest area would not be included in the transfer to the federal government. The *Daily News* report concluded with the statement that Colonel Nagler, director of conservation, telegraphed to the federal forest body that the land commission had approved the transfer.

On December 12, 1928, the National Forest Reservation Commission approved the establishment of the Oneida Purchase Unit, consisting of approximately 148,480 acres (or 232 square miles) in Forest, Oneida, and Vilas counties under authority of Section 6 of the Clark-McNary Act. The reasons for acquisition were stated as: “(a) Timber production; (b) determination and demonstration of best principles of forest management in the region; (c) stabilization of waterflow.”

My conclusions drawn from this history are that the Nicolet and Chequamegon National Forests exist in Wisconsin today because of the support of the people in the counties where the forests are located. Three factors influenced my findings: (1) The process for approval of the original purchase units placed the ultimate approval authority in the hands of local officials, i.e. the county boards; (2) While there was some opposition at the local level, the majority opinion not only endorsed the idea of national forests, but had counties actively competing for the opportunity to have portions of the authorized 500,000 acres of forest purchase located within their counties; (3) Local supporters were motivated by the belief that the long term economic gains that would result from the federal government’s acquisition, restoration, and management of the “cut-over” lands would exceed the short term losses of a reduced county tax base, or any of the al-

ternative management strategies then proposed for the cut-over lands.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 2000

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, my participation in the June 15th White House Strategy Session on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Students caused me to miss Rollcall votes 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290 and 291. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall #278, Providing for the consideration of H.R. 4635, Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, FY 2001—Nay.

Rollcall #279, Nethercutt (WA) Amendment to the Dicks Amendment that sought to strike reference to the planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #280, Hansen of Utah Amendment to Dicks Amendment that sought to strike reference to the planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #281, Dicks of Washington Amendment that exempts activities otherwise authorized by law to the planning and management of national monuments or activities related to the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan from any limitations imposed under the Act—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #282, Stearns of Florida Amendment (as modified) that sought to decrease National Endowment for the Arts funding by \$1.9 million or approximately 2% and increase wildlife fire management funding accordingly—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #283, Slaughter of New York Amendment that defers an additional \$22 million of prior year clean coal technology funding—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #284, Obey Motion that the Committee Rise—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #286, Sanders of Vermont Amendment No. 29 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that sought to make available \$10 million to establish a northeast home heating oil reserve and transfer strategic petroleum reserve funding for this purpose—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #287, Doggett motion that the Committee Rise—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #288, Nethercutt of Washington Amendment that implements the previously agreed to Dicks amendment except for activities related to planning and management of national monuments—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #289, Weldon of Florida Amendment No. 48 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that sought to prohibit any funding to be used to publish Class III gaming procedures under part 291 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—No.

Rollcall #290, Dicks motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back with an amendment to increase funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by \$15 million, the National Endowment for the Humanities by \$5 million, and Office of Museum Services by \$2 million—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Aye.

Rollcall #291, Passage—Department of the Interior Appropriations for FY 2001 (H.R. 4578)—Nay.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF
PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI-BIAN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the May 20, 2000, Inaugural Address of President Chen Shui-Bian of Taiwan. President Chen has laid out a solid vision of Taiwan's future and his speech deserves wide dissemination.

The United States is pleased with the flourishing on Taiwan of a fully-fledged, multi-party democracy which respects human rights and civil liberties. It is hoped that Taiwan will serve as an example to the PRC and others in the region in this regard and will encourage progress in the furthering of democratic principles and practices, respect for human rights, and the enhancement of the rule of law.

The Congress looks forward to a broadening and deepening of friendship and cooperation with Taiwan in the years ahead for the mutual benefit of the peoples of the United States and Taiwan.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to wish President Chen, Vice President Lu, and the people of Taiwan the very best in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I submit President Chen's Inaugural Address for insertion in the RECORD.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT CHEN
SHUI-BIAN, MAY 20, 2000

Leaders of our friendly nations, honored guests and compatriots from Taiwan and abroad; This is a glorious moment; it is also a moment of dignity and hope.

I thank our honored guests, who have come here from afar, as well as those friends from around the world who love democracy and care about Taiwan, for sharing this glorious moment with us.

We are here today, not just to celebrate an inauguration, but to witness the hard-won democratic values, and to witness the beginning of a new era.

On the eve of the 21st Century, the people of Taiwan have completed a historic alternation of political parties in power. This is not only the first of its kind in the history of the Republic of China, but also an epochal landmark for Chinese communities around the world. Taiwan has not only set a new model for the Asian experience of democ-

racy, but has also added a moving example to the third wave of democracy the world over.

The election for the 10th-term President of the Republic of China has clearly shown the world that the fruits of freedom and democracy are not easily come by. Twenty-three million people with an unwavering will have allayed enmity with love, overcome intimidation with hope, and conquered fear with faith.

With our sacred votes, we have proven to the world that freedom and democracy are indisputable universal values, and that peace is humanity's highest goal.

The outcome of Taiwan's Year 2000 presidential election is not the victory of an individual or a political party. It is a victory of the people, a victory for democracy, because we have, while at the focus of global attention, transcended fear, threats and oppression and bravely risen to our feet together.

Taiwan stands up, demonstrating a firmness of purpose and faith in democracy. Taiwan stands up, representing the self-confidence of the people and the dignity of the country. Taiwan stands up, symbolizing the quest for hope and the realization of dreams.

Dear compatriots, let's always remember this moment; let's always remember to value and feel gratitude for it, because the fruits of democracy did not come out of the blue. It was realized by going through many perils and dangers, and by experiencing countless hardships. If not for the fearless sacrifice of our democratic forebears, if not for the unswerving faith of the tens of millions of Taiwanese people in freedom and democracy, we could not possibly be standing on our beloved land today and celebrate a glorious occasion that belongs to all the people.

Today, it is as if we are standing before a fresh new gate in history. In the process of democratization, the Taiwanese people have created a brand-new key to our shared destiny. The new century's gates of hope are soon to open. We are humble but not submissive. We are full of self-confidence but not the slightest bit of self-satisfaction.

Since that moment on March 18 when the election results came to light, I have accepted the mandate of all Taiwanese people in a most earnest and humble frame of mind, and have vowed to devote all my efforts, understanding and courage to assuming the heavy responsibility of this country's future.

I personally understand that the significance of the alternation of political parties and the peaceful transition of power lies not in that it is a change of personnel or political parties. Nor that it is a dynastic change. Rather, it is the return of state and government power to the people through a democratic procedure. The people are the true masters of the country, which no individual or political party can possess. From the head of state to the rank-and-file civil servant—the government exists for all the people and serves all the people.

The alternation of political parties does not mean an all-out negation of the past. We should be fair in evaluating the contributions made by those in power throughout the ages. Mr. Lee Teng-hui deserves our highest praise and heartfelt honor for his promotion of democratic reforms and for his excellent performance during his twelve years of leadership.

Taiwan society has rallied and participated energetically in the election. Despite the diverse views and stances, all individuals share the same intent—to come forward for the sake of their political ideas and the country's future. We believe that the end of an

election is the beginning of reconciliation. After the curtain falls on emotional campaigns, rationality should prevail. Under the supreme principles of national interests and the welfare of the people, those in power and in opposition should both fulfill their duties by the people and realize the ideals of fair competition in party politics, as well as the checks and balances of democratic politics.

A democratic society with fair competition, tolerance and trust is the strongest impetus for a nation's development. Placing national interests above those of political parties, we should solidify the will of the people and seek consensus among the ruling and opposition parties, to promote the country's development and reforms.

"A government for all people" and "rule by the clean and upright" were my promises to the people during the election period. It is also an important key for Taiwan society in stepping over its fault lines and exalting to a higher level in the future.

The spirit of a "government for all people" lies in the fact that "government exists for the people." The people are the masters and shareholders of the state. The government should rule on the basis of majority public opinion. The interests of the people are absolutely above those of any political party or individual.

I have always taken pride in being a member of the Democratic Progressive Party, but from the moment I take my oath and assume the president's post, I will put all my efforts into fulfilling my role as a "president for all people." As in the formation of the new government, we employ people according to their talents and do not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, gender or party affiliation. We will also place the welfare of the populace as our primary goal in future.

The topmost initiatives of my promise to "rule by the clean and upright" are to eliminate "black gold"—the involvement of organized crimes in politics—and to eradicate vote-buying. For a long time, the Taiwanese people have been deeply repelled by money politics and the interference of organized crime. A grassroots vote-buying culture has also robbed the people of their right to elect the wise and the able. These have tainted the development of Taiwan's democracy.

Today, I am willing to promise hereby that the new government will eliminate vote-buying and crack down on "black gold" politics, so that Taiwan can rise above such downward sinking forces. We must give the people a clean political environment.

In the area of government reforms, we need to establish a government that is clean, efficient, farsighted, dynamic, highly flexible and responsive, in order to ensure Taiwan's competitiveness in the face of increasingly fierce global competition. The age of "large and capable" governments has now passed, replace by "small and effective" governments, which have established partnership relations with the people. We should accelerate the streamlining of government functions and organization and actively expand the role of public participation.

This will not only allow the public to fully utilize their energy but also significantly reduce the government's burden. Similar partnership relations should also be set up between the central and local governments. We want to break the authoritarian attitudes from the days of centralized, money-controlled power. We want to realize the spirit of local autonomy, where the local and central governments share resources and responsibilities, where "the central government will not do what the local governments